

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Renaldo Graham,

PETITIONER

v.

United States of America,

RESPONDENT

Crim. No. 4:05-cr-00076-TLW-1

C/A No. 4:16-cv-02336-TLW

Order

Petitioner Renaldo Graham pled guilty to charges of Hobbs Act robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a) (Count 1); and using a short-barreled shotgun during and in relation to a crime of violence, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) (Count 2). The Court sentenced him to a total of 172 months incarceration, consisting of 52 months on Count 1 and 120 months consecutive on Count 2. ECF No. 34. In his § 2255 petition, he asks the Court to “vacate the judgment in this case and correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 and Johnson v. United States, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (June 26, 2015). Also see Welch v. United States, Hubbard v. United States in which all three cases support this instant motion.” ECF No. 42. Giving his petition a liberal construction, he appears to be arguing that Hobbs Act robbery is no longer a § 924(c) predicate crime of violence.

As to the force clause of § 924(c), every circuit court that has addressed the issue has concluded that substantive Hobbs Act robbery is a valid § 924(c) predicate under the force clause. *See United States v. Garcia-Ortiz*, 904 F.3d 102, 109 (1st Cir. 2018); *United States v. Melgar-Cabrera*, 892 F.3d 1053, 1064–65 (10th Cir. 2018);

United States v. Hill, 890 F.3d 51, 60 (2d Cir. 2018); *United States v. Gooch*, 850 F.3d 285, 292 (6th Cir. 2017); *United States v. Rivera*, 847 F.3d 847, 848–49 (7th Cir. 2017); *United States v. Buck*, 847 F.3d 267, 274–75 (5th Cir. 2017); *United States v. Howard*, 650 F. App’x 466, 468 (9th Cir. 2016); *In re Saint Fleur*, 824 F.3d 1337, 1340–41 (11th Cir. 2016); *United States v. House*, 825 F.3d 381, 387 (8th Cir. 2016). There is no basis to conclude that the Fourth Circuit would rule contrary to its sister circuits.¹

The analysis in the above cases applies here and is persuasive. Accordingly, the Court embraces that authority and concludes that Hobbs Act robbery qualifies as a § 924(c) predicate under the force clause.² *See also Stokeling v. United States*, 139 S. Ct. 544, 551, 554 (2019) (concluding that a robbery conviction is a violent felony under the ACCA’s force clause as long as the conviction categorically required force sufficient to overcome a victim’s resistance, however slight the resistance); *United States v. Evans*, 848 F.3d 242, 247–48 (4th Cir. 2017) (concluding that carjacking under 18 U.S.C. § 2119 is a crime of violence under § 924(c)(3)(A)); *United States v.*

¹ The Court notes that this issue is currently before the Fourth Circuit in at least three cases: *United States v. Allen*, No. 4:02-cr-00750-TLW-2 (D.S.C. Feb. 5, 2019) (order denying § 2255 petition), *appeal docketed*, No. 19-6305 (4th Cir. Mar. 4, 2019); *United States v. Gleaton*, No. 3:18-cr-00006-TLW-1 (D.S.C. Mar. 26, 2018) (order denying motion to dismiss), *appeal docketed*, No. 18-4558 (4th Cir. Aug. 8, 2018); *United States v. Wilson*, No. 3:17-cr-00138-TLW-1 (D.S.C. Sept. 22, 2017) (order denying motion to dismiss), *appeal docketed*, No. 18-4159 (4th Cir. Mar. 15, 2018).

² As to § 924(c)’s residual clause, the Fourth Circuit recently concluded that it is unconstitutionally vague. *United States v. Simms*, 914 F.3d 229, 232 (4th Cir. 2019) (en banc). However, *Simms* has no impact on this case because that decision only involved the residual clause, not the force clause.

McNeal, 818 F.3d 141, 153 (4th Cir. 2016) (concluding that bank robbery under 18 U.S.C. § 2113(a) is a crime of violence under § 924(c)(3)(A)).

Because Hobbs Act robbery qualifies as a crime of violence under § 924(c)(3)(A), Petitioner's petition for relief pursuant to § 2255, ECF No. 42, is **DENIED**. This action is hereby **DISMISSED**.³

The Court has reviewed this petition in accordance with Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings. In order for the Court to issue a certificate of appealability, Rule 11 requires that Petitioner satisfy the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), which in turn requires that he "has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." The Court concludes that he has not made such a showing, and it is therefore not appropriate to issue a certificate of appealability as to the issues raised in this petition. Petitioner is advised that he may seek a certificate from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals under Rule 22 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Senior United States District Judge

April 17, 2019
Columbia, South Carolina

³ A response from the Government is not required because "the motion and the files and records of the case conclusively show that [Petitioner] is entitled to no relief" 28 U.S.C. § 2255(b).